

22



“Note upon the frequent Occurrence of *Tenia Echinococcus* in the Domestic Dog in certain parts of Australia.”

By JOHN DAVIES THOMAS, M.D. (Lond.), F.R.C.S. (Eng.), lately Physician to the Adelaide Hospital and Member of the Council of the University of Adelaide. Communicated by T. S. COBBOLD, M.D., F.R.S. Received June 4, 1885.

From the well-known prevalence of hyatid disease (both in man and the domestic herbivora) in certain parts of the Australian continent, it might naturally be expected that *Tenia Echinococcus* should be often found in the domestic dogs of these parts, but as far as I know, no investigation had been made by any observer with a view to the determination of the point in question.

Accordingly, towards the close of the year 1882, I commenced an inquiry into the matter, and although I have been prevented by the claims of my daily professional duties from an exhaustive investigation of the point, yet the facts already ascertained fully account for the very serious prevalence of hyatid disease in the localities where investigation has been made.

Dogs were examined at the following places in South Australia:—

1. In the city of Adelaide; 2. At Mount Gambier; 3. At Millicent;
4. At Penola.

The three last-named places are situated in the south-eastern district of the province, which is the most highly infected part of Australia as regards hyatid disease.

In all four places *Tænia Echinococcus* was found in the stray dogs captured by the police.

1. *Adelaide*.—In the first instance, *twenty* dogs were examined here. *Tænia Echinococcus* was found in *nine*, and in numbers varying from a few specimens up to many thousands. (Microscopic specimens of some of these accompany this paper.)

2. *Mount Gambier*.—*Five* dogs were examined here on December 7, 1882. *Two* contained numerous examples of *Tænia Echinococcus*.

3. *Millicent*.—Out of *four* dogs examined, *one* contained this parasite.

4. *Penola*.—The single dog examined at this place had thousands of specimens of *Tænia Echinococcus* in its small intestine.

Including all the dogs examined in 1882 (thirty in number) *no fewer than 40 per cent.* were infested by this dangerous tapeworm.

However it should be stated that nine dogs have been examined by me more recently, and that in only one of these could I find *Tænia Echinococcus*. This series of dogs differed from the former one in some respects. The first group of dogs consisted of vagrant and ownerless animals that must have picked up their living largely from slaughter-houses, butchers' shops, and offal heaps. These naturally would have many opportunities of eating the viscera of slaughtered animals, cast aside as unfit for sale. When the second series was procured, a very energetic raid against unregistered dogs had been made by the police for several months, consequently many of the dogs of this group had owners, by whom they were fed, but who were unwilling to pay the registration fee required by law.

*In Melbourne*.—*Ten* stray dogs collected in the town of Hotham (which is really a part of Melbourne) were examined on January 15th and 16th, 1883. *Five* of them contained *Tænia Echinococcus* in greater or less number. These observations show a very alarming prevalence of this dangerous parasite in the places where inquiry into the matter has been made, and fully explain the frequency of the cystic form (hyatid) both in man and the domestic herbivora of these localities.

In connexion with this subject, it may be mentioned that, according to Cobbold, this tapeworm has never been seen in any English dog which had not previously been experimentally infected.

Even in Iceland only 28 per cent. of the dogs examined by Krabbe were found to contain this tapeworm.